

### III. REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. By this amendment claims 1, 9, 17, 21 and 23 have been amended and claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-20, 22 and 24-26 have been canceled. As a result, claims 1-26 remain pending in this application. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 7-9 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Flemming *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,664,210), hereafter “Flemming.” Claims 4-6, 10-13 and 17-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Flemming in view of Habib *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,694,610), hereafter “Habib.”

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections over Flemming and various other references, Applicants assert that the references cited by the Office do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 9, 17, 21 and 23, Applicants submit that the Office does not prove that the cited references teach or suggest the method is adapted to allow selection of the second set of data that overlaps the first set of data. The Office admits that Flemming does not specifically teach this feature. Instead, the Office relies on a passage of Habib. However, the passage in Habib cited by the Office describes selection of text already selected within a dialog box. To this extent, the selection of

the text of Habib is not of overlapping text in the same application from which the selected sets were selected but rather is within a dialog box external to the application. To this extent, the selection of text of Habib does not overlap text in the application that was previously selected and remains selected, but rather is of a set of text that is in a completely different location from the first set of text. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With further respect to independent claims 17, 21 and 23, Applicants submit that the cited references also fail to teach or suggest selecting, in a distinctive manner, a portion of one of the selected sets of data in a same window of the application from which the selected sets were selected, wherein the one of the selected sets of data remains selected during the selection of the portion. The Office admits that Flemming does not specifically teach this feature. Instead, the Office relies on a passage of Habib. However, the passage in Habib cited by the Office describes selection of text already selected within a dialog box. To this extent, the selection of the text of Habib is not “in a same window of the application from which the selected sets were selected” but rather is within a dialog box external to the original window. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to independent claims listed above. In addition, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicants will forego addressing each of these rejections individually, but reserve the right to do so should it become necessary. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. These features have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hunter E. Webb/

---

Hunter E. Webb  
Reg. No.: 54,593

Date: February 2, 2009

Hoffman Warnick LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044  
(518) 449-0047 (fax)